

*Canadian Flag*

crowns, from the design of our flag. I know there are also other areas in the country which do not support the Prime Minister in the presentation of his design, for other and varying reasons. I also know, and let us not be naïve about this, that the people in Quebec, not totally but almost so, want to relieve the Canadian flag of any association with the union jack, and by the same token they have suggested that they do not want any association on the flag with their mother country, in the form of the fleur-de-lis. I may be wrong here, but this is what I find in my consultations with Canadians from Quebec. They have expressed this view that they want no association with their mother country, and want no sign of the fleur-de-lis on the Canadian flag.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Winkler:** I have an area of support there and I am going to try to prove this point. This is precisely the reason I am speaking this afternoon and I ask that we be careful in our approach so that greater division may not occur.

I have a number of excerpts before me, and the one I have in my hand is from the book "Canadians in the Making" by Professor Lower of Queen's University. It refers to conditions in Canada when it was a colony of France. One of the leaders of that day, according to this book, said:

Canada produces nothing that can ever possibly make a colony flourish.

It goes on to say:

In France, few tears were shed for the loss of Canada. The king had fortified both Louisburg and Quebec at vast expense and to fight the seven years war he had sent some good officers and some thousands of troops. But the heart of France had never been in colonizing ventures. Louis XIV himself had explained that "to people Canada, it would be necessary to depopulate France," and thereby he had made the great refusal, deciding to keep his subjects at home.

It goes on to say this, referring to the foreign service of the French government of that day:

In such circles, what was chiefly known about it was that it was costing the government about 500,000 livres a year; if we take the livre as equal to about a dollar of our money, half a million a year seems a small price to pay for a foothold in America. But it seemed large to the French government, too large. No wonder that when an appeal for more force came from Canada, at the height of her agony, the French minister, mindful of his country's perils on the battlegrounds of Europe, could answer: "When the house is on fire, we cannot bother about the stable."

It continues:

The greatest of the voices was that of Voltaire and that sharp-tongued man did not spare poor Canada. "In truth you should drive home with the Duke de Choiseul (the chief minister of the time) my taste for Louisiana. I have never been able to understand how they came to choose the most detestable country in the north, only to be kept by ruinous wars, and abandon the finest climate on earth." "We had the inclination to establish ourselves in Canada upon the snows, between the bears and the beavers." And again, in his *Candide*, the well-known: "You know that these two nations are at war for a few acres of snow and that they are spending for that war far more than Canada is worth." Finally, after he had heard of the loss of Canada: "In one day ...1,500 leagues of land had been lost. These 1,500 leagues, being glacial deserts, were not, perhaps, really a loss. Canada cost much and brought in very little..." Voltaire was only the most extreme of many. Just as a century later many "little Englanders" tried to throw away the British Empire—

This is one of the reasons why the descendants of the French are no longer interested in having an emblem of that country on Canada's flag.

Then we have that part of Canadian history which is never talked about. I feel Canadians have always learned the history of the United States in more detail and at greater length than their own, because of the situation that exists between our two races. I do not consider myself an authority on history because I have had to research these things myself, but I know Canadians in Quebec are not proud of part of their history and this is one of the reasons they detest symbolic association with their mother country.

Quoting from "The Fight for Canada" by W. Wood, with reference to the time Canada was a colony of France, we find that Vaudreuil was:

—a liar, a backbiter, and a pettifogger, utterly unfit for his great position; and the best excuse that can be made for him is that he was almost as great a fool as a knave.

Dealing with Bigot it says:

He deliberately set to work to create universal destitution in order that he might requisition help from France and make his commission on it.

In other words, he was a commissioner of the day. He bought from the government of France and sold to the people of New France. That is a pretty good deal even today, Mr. Speaker. This book goes on to say:

Bigot's object was to get the farmers completely at his mercy, by keeping all transportation in the hands of his own contractors.

It goes on to say that he was not alone in this, and that all the businessmen of that day were in a hurry to make their fortunes before the French lost the colony to the British.